ABSTRACT In this article, other-repetition after informing statements is investigated in a corpus of institutional encounters between native Norwegian clerks and non-native clients. Such repetition is used to display receipt of information. A plain repeat with falling intonation is described as a display of hearing, whereas a repeat plus a final response particle, 'ja' (yes), constitutes a claim of understanding. Repeats with high-tone response particles (rising intonation) in addition display emotional stance, such as surprise or interest, and these are primarily exploited for the purposes of topic organization. In the cross-linguistic context of the current encounters, the native speakers are shown to use receipts as embedded corrections of the non-native speaker’s utterances. The repeats also have certain formal features that are characteristic of the situation, such as less pronominalization and ellipsis, and this is explained as a procedure to ensure the joint construal of linguistic form.
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1. Introduction

In conversation, understanding of a prior turn at talk is usually taken for granted and only indirectly displayed as presuppositions in the design of the next sequentially relevant action. However, at times conversationalists display their construal in more explicit ways, for instance, by repeating or paraphrasing the prior contribution. This article deals with repetition as a way of displaying the speaker’s construal. This is a typical instance:

(1) IFF 3

S: hvor mange år gikk ‘du på skolen da?  S: for how many years did ‘you go to school?
C: ‘tolv år.  C: ‘twelve years.
C: ja.  C: yeah.
...(4.0) ((S skriver))  
...(4.0) ((S writes))
The repetition here is a metalinguistic use; it does not commit the speaker to the truth of the previous statement (that C has attended school for twelve years), but merely shows that it has been registered. Such repeats generally occur after statements presenting new (and often precise) information, and are therefore called ‘information receipts’. In Norwegian, such receipts often include the response words ‘ja’ (yes) or ‘nei’ (no) as a final particle:

(2) IFF 2
S: du er ‘gift er du ikke ‘det? S: you’re ‘married aren’t you?
B: jeg er ‘gift. B: I’m ‘married,
og har ‘tre ^barn. and have ‘three ^children.
(three children yes)
B: [ja.] B: [yeah]
S: [og] ’kona di jobber ^hun eller? S: [and] your ‘wife does ^she work?

The particle here is pronounced in a low tone, and the receipt constitutes a sequence- and topic-closing move. Other repeats have high-tone particles, and they are often responded to by topic elaboration. Interestingly, there is an almost identical instance in the corpus of the question–answer sequence in the example above; only here the particle is pronounced with a high tone:

(3) IFF 1
S: du er ^gift du ikke ‘sant?: S: you are ^married right?
@@[@@@]@ (three children yes)
‘jaha hvor gamle er de ^barna dine a? alright how old are your ^children (then)?
A: .. e= ‘sto=re ‘barnet mitt er snart ‘fem ^år, A: .. uh= my ‘bi=g ‘child is soon ’five ^years,

The repeat here is yet another display of the speaker’s construal of the answer. But, in addition, it is a display of an emotional reaction to it, which is not present in the first instance. And whereas the previous repeat closed the topic of the children, this one occurs in an environment where the topic is established and elaborated.

These three forms of repetition represent ways of receiving information that display different degrees of understanding and emotional stance, and that have different sequential implications. This is the topic of the following sections. The data come from institutional (bureaucratic) interactions between native clerks and non-native clients, a type of situation that engenders extensive use of information receipts. It will be argued that some of the uses of repetition identified here are related to these characteristics of the conversations, whereas others seem to be of more general applicability.
2. Theoretical framework and data

It is a participant concern to arrive at mutual understanding sufficient to attain the practical goals of the communicative activity. Studying understanding as a practical accomplishment means shifting the focus from individual mental processes to social, interactional processes. This can be carried out by investigating how interlocutors arrive at a joint construal of a contribution (rather than what the speaker intended or what inferences the hearer has made). A joint construal of a contribution is an agreement between the interlocutors on what the speaker is taken to mean by it (Clark, 1996: 212). This process entails that they display to each other their perception (hearing) and interpretation (understanding) of the other’s utterance, that is, their construal of it. Such public displays of construals are manifested in the reactive aspects of the next turn. The turn-taking organization of conversation is designed to facilitate this task, in that every new contribution will be addressed to the immediately prior turn (unless it is signalled otherwise), and thereby will reveal something about the speaker’s understanding of it (Heritage, 1984; Schegloff and Sacks 1974). This display of the interlocutor’s construal provides the original speaker with the opportunity to inspect how he or she has been understood, and to subsequently validate or correct the construal in the third position of the sequence (Clark, 1996: 194; Schegloff, 1992). In this way, displays of construals and reactions to them are the fundamental steps in the process of establishing intersubjectivity.

Displays of construals may either be presented as actions in and of themselves, or they may be embedded in the next sequentially relevant action. Independent displays of understanding are typically performed as paraphrases, as noted by Sacks (1992) with reference to this example:

(4) (From Sacks, 1992, vol. 2: 141)

A: Where are you staying?
B: In Pacific Pallisades.
A: Oh at the west side of town.

Being able to say more or less the same thing with other words requires interpretation. In this example speaker A shows that she has identified the referent of ‘Pacific Pallisades’ and she provides a piece of information that displays this interpretation. Such explicit displays of understanding do not contribute to the topical development or sequential progression of the conversation but rather take the form of side sequences or sequence expansions (as in example (4)).

Whereas paraphrases display parts of the interlocutor’s understanding, repetition is equivocal in this respect:

(5) (from Sacks, 1992, vol. 2: 141)

A: Where are you staying?
B: In Pacific Pallisades.
A: Oh. Pacific Pallisades.
According to Sacks, this might be a case of ‘showing understanding’, but it might also be other things. Schegloff (1997) substantiates this claim by showing that repeats with falling intonation may be heard either as marking receipt or as initiating repair, the first being a sequence-closing action and the other projecting a response (minimally a confirmation). He points out that this ambiguity may be real to participants, occasionally making them hesitate between whether or not to respond (p. 530). The paradoxical thing about this is that the first case seems to be a display of understanding whereas the other seems to indicate a problem of understanding (or at least some degree of uncertainty). The same token thus seems to have two opposite meanings, which seems rather unusual.

Sorjonen (1996) explicitly treats this ambiguity of repetition. She shows that Finnish has two different response particles, ‘niin’ and ‘joo’, that treat a repeat in different ways. ‘Niin’ displays an understanding of the repeat as an expression of uncertainty (a repair initiation) in that it provides a confirmation, whereas ‘joo’ treats the repeat as a non-problematic registration of prior talk and merely reconfirms the information.

In addition to the issue of displaying certainty or uncertainty, there is a complex question concerning what a repeat is a construal of. Sorjonen notes that a repeat may either concern the expression used and thus be a construal of hearing, or it may deal with issues of understanding. In addition to this, it has also been noted that repeats may be involved in signalling acceptance or rejection of a contribution. Schegloff (1997) shows that one use of repeats is to preface rejections, corrections, misalignments and other non-preferred actions.

This multifunctionality of repetition calls for an analytic division between different levels of communicative actions. Austin (1962) proposed such a layering of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, and this proposal has been rephrased within an explicitly interactional framework in Clark’s ladder of joint actions (see Table 1).

This ladder constitutes an implicational scale, so that in order to perform an action at level 4, the interlocutors must go through all the actions at lower levels (‘upward causality’). This also provides for ‘downward evidence’, that is, a joint action at one level gives evidence that the actions at lower levels have been accomplished (Clark, 1996: 152).

What we have referred to above as ‘hearing’ is involved at level 2: presenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Clark’s ladder of joint actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Clarke, 1996: 152)
and identifying linguistic signals. Even at this level, the utterance needs to be jointly construed. When interlocutors repeat an utterance, they show active participation in establishing a joint construal of ‘what was said’. The process of achieving ‘understanding’ is described at level 3: signalling and recognizing a speech act. Processes involved here are assignments of reference, illocutionary force and sequential implicativeness. Level 4 designates the participants’ establishment of a joint project (for instance, a question–answer sequence) and thus involves issues of acceptance and alignment. The term ‘construal’ designates the participants’ individual perceptions and understandings of an utterance at any one of these levels as they are displayed to the interlocutor in a turn at talk.

This model will be used to differentiate between the various functions of repetition, and it has the advantage that it allows us to explain some of the paradoxes and ambiguities involved. The following sections treat, first, repeats with falling intonation (with or without a final particle), which mark receipt of information (Section 3), and second, repeats with high-tone response particles, which in addition display emotional stance (Section 4).

The data for the study are videotaped, naturally occurring consultations in various public service institutions in Norway: an unemployment office, a job-qualifying centre for immigrants, and a social welfare office for newly arrived immigrants and refugees. The consultations were in general concerned with assisting the immigrants to adapt to social life in Norway, and included issues of education, employment, housing, etc. They were conducted in Norwegian, which means that the clients speak in a second language, and the clerks speak in their mother tongue.

Originally, an electronic, searchable database was created of all other-repetitions in the corpus, amounting to 328 instances. Each extract was classified according to the following formal features shown in Table 2.

This classification revealed some fundamental co-occurrence patterns in the data and was of help in the process of identifying functionally distinct types of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Distinctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic material</td>
<td>single word – phrase – clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>native – non-native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>rising – falling – level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response word</td>
<td>initial – final – no response word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated utterance</td>
<td>question – statement about B-event – answer – informing – assessment – other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconicity</td>
<td>part – whole – pronominalized – expanded – lexically/grammatically modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>no response – minimal response – topical expansion – repair initiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
repetition. Of all the instances, 73 were identified as a special type of repetition constituting answers to questions (so-called ‘echo answers’), and these were extracted and have been described elsewhere (Svennevig, forthcoming a). Sixty instances were identified as repair initiations and have also been described in another article (Svennevig, forthcoming b).

The database of the current study consists of 195 instances of repetition that are considered to be primarily concerned with marking receipt of information. They are characterized by the formal features of being responses to informing (non-requestive) speech acts, and having either falling intonation or a final response particle (with either high or low tone). Of the total number of receipts, 115 are simple repetitions, 62 have a low-tone final response particle and 18 have a high-tone particle.

The classification scheme also helped identify certain form characteristics within the classes of repetition, such as patterns of ellipsis, pronominalization and response. But the bulk of the analytic work in identifying functional aspects of the repeats consisted of conversation analytic close reading (and listening), using participant orientation as displayed in the actual turns at talk as the main basis for making theoretical claims.

3. Falling repeats as receipts of information

Repetition may be a way of marking receipt of a piece of new information. Such repeats have falling intonation and typically occur in third position after an answer to a question, such as here:

(6) AETAT 1

S: og jeg søker deg ‘inn. S: and I apply for ‘you.
K: mhm. K: mhm
S: på det ‘kurset. S: for that ‘course.
K: [e=] ‘gå på den ^Bjerkebanen eller?K: [uh=] ‘go to that ^Bjerkebanen?
S: ‘nei det er på ^Linderudsenteret. S: ‘no it’s at ^Linderud Centre.
S: og ‘det er jo ‘mulig med ^banen ikke ‘sant? S: and ‘that is ‘possible with the ^subway ‘right?

The client here receives an answer that is contrary to her initial expectation about the location of the course. The repeat shows that she has registered this piece of information, which is clearly new to her, given that it is contrary to the expectations displayed in the question.

3.1 Displays of hearing and understanding in receipts

The repeat in example (6) is a display of the client’s hearing, that is, her construal of the phonological form of the referring expression (level 2 in the action ladder). The receipt does not, however, imply that she has identified the referent of the expression (as an issue of understanding, level 3) or that she accepts the
answer as relevant or true (an issue of accepting the speech act, level 4). This can be observed in cases where such repeats are followed by indications of problems of understanding and acceptance. In the following case, the client produces a repeat of the answer, but this is not taken as sufficient evidence that he has understood the answer. Previous to the extract, the clerk has offered the client a place on a job-seeking course, and explained what the course consists of:

(7) IFF 5

E: . . .(1.7) men e= den sjetten 'etasje er det e==
. . .(1.3) hva er=
<X jeg kan 'lese elle==
hv- hva vi da– X>
S: ja 'lese,
d-vække 'norskopplæring.
hvis det er 'det du tenker på.
det er e== 'jobssøking.
E: jobssøking.
S: ja.
E: .. mhm.
S: . . . der 'får du e= 'mulighet for å 'lære á 'skrive en ^søknad, .. 'riktig ^søknad.
E: mhm_ S: og så får du 'hjelp til å 'finne alle 'ledige 'stillinger som 'du kan ^søke på.
E: [ja_] S: [og] 'sende ^søknader på ^det. E: mhm_

The client seems to ask what the course will contain, and the reference to his reading skills makes the clerk interpret the question as whether or not it will be a Norwegian course. His answer ('job-seeking') is repeated by the client, and they also expand the sequence with a round of minimal acknowledgements where the client passes the opportunity of initiating repair and the clerk of expanding the answer. There is so far no evidence that the answer is problematic. However, after this, the clerk expands after all, giving a new explanation of what a job-seeking course is. This shows that he does not consider the repeat as evidence of understanding, but merely of hearing.

In other cases, a repeat precedes a misaligning contribution, involving disagreement with or non-acceptance of the interlocutor’s prior contribution. This is illustrated in the following example, in which they discuss the language form of a textbook. In order to understand the example, it is important to know that Norwegian has two official written standards, nynorsk (literally ‘new Norwegian’) and bokmål (literally ‘book language’), which the client here refers to as ‘old Norwegian’:
Here the client repeats the answer, but immediately expands with a renewed question, which treats the clerk's answer as insufficient or inappropriate to her initial question. She does not get an answer that fits with the alternatives she has asked for, and she displays this misfit by returning to one of the original alternatives. She thus displays that she has registered the answer by repeating it (level 2), but does not accept it as fulfilling her communicative project (level 4).

There are also cases where an acceptance is given in a separate utterance after the receipt, such as here:

(9) FINN 2

The clerk here first produces a repeat as a receipt of the information, and only subsequently responds with an acceptance of the claim made by the client. Thus, the repeat does not itself signal acceptance of the claim.

As noted at the outset, some repeats have the response words 'ja' (yes) or 'nei' (no) in utterance final position (as in examples (2) and (3)). Here the response words do not accomplish 'answering', but are instead particles conveying pragmatic meaning. The choice of response word follows the polarity of the
utterance, so that positive polarity produces ‘ja’ as a particle and negative polarity produces ‘nei’ (as in example (17)). In Norwegian, such particles in tag position are unstressed and are produced with either a high or a low boundary tone (Fretheim, 1983). The particles associated with information receipts have particles with low boundary tone (falling intonation). Repetition with high-tone particles (rising intonation) seems to do more than just display receipt of information, and is therefore treated separately, in Section 4.

Repeats with final response particles (‘ja’ or ‘nei’) differ from plain repeats in signalling the level of understanding of the prior contribution. When a response particle is added, the speaker does not just display a construal of linguistic form, but in addition signals understanding (level 3) and acceptance (level 4) of the contribution. Consider the following extract:

\[(10)\] FINN 3

\[J:\] and then uh=.. ‘I have–
\[\] ‘we have–
\[\] my br- ‘brother ‘says.
\[\] we have an ‘uncle.
\[\] ((SIDE SEQUENCE OMITTED))
\[S:\] who is in–
\[\] who [[lives]] in ^Norway?
\[J:\] [[yes.]]
\[S:\] yeah.
\[J:\] yeah l- I ‘think you ‘know.
\[\] ‘he has ‘worked ‘here?
\[S:\] ‘Oudi (yes).
\[\] yeah ‘he who has ‘worked ‘here?
\[J:\] [yeah.]
\[S:\] yeah.
\[J:\] yes.
\[S:\] yeah ‘right.

The addition of the particle ‘ja’ here displays that the speaker has identified the referent – that she knows whom S is talking about – and not just that she has reached a construal of the foreign name. The identity of the referent is checked in the subsequent question, but this confirmation check shows that the speaker has reached candidate identification.

Further evidence for the claim that final response particles signal higher level construals is the fact that they are never followed by repair indicating that the speaker has not reached a (potential) understanding, the way simple repeats are occasionally (cf. examples (7) and (8)).

3.2 SEQUENTIAL ASPECTS OF RECEIPTS

Receipts of information occur either as post-expansions to adjacency pairs (68 instances in the corpus, cf. examples (1)–(3)) or following statements in other sequential environments (110 instances, cf. examples (8)–(9)). They are not projected by the prior contribution, as evidenced by the fact that the interlocutor sometimes initiates a new turn immediately, resulting in overlapping turns:
Here the repeat starts simultaneously with the client expanding his answer. The client is thus not waiting for a receipt, nor does he abort his new turn to let the clerk complete his receipt before continuing. Although produced in overlap, the receipt is not treated as a threat to B’s right to the floor. There are thus several features of these receipts that associate them with ‘listener talk’ (Gardner, 2001). They primarily give meta-communicative information, they are not projected by prior talk, and they are prosodically and interactionally backgrounded in relation to other talk that may compete for the floor (cf. Sorjonen, 1996: 312).

Another feature that receipts have in common with listener talk is that they usually get no response, as in example (6), or only a minimal acknowledgement, as in example (7) (partly repeated here):

(6) (repeated extract)
S: ‘nei det er på Linderudsenteret. S: ‘no it’s at Linderud Centre.
S: og ‘det er jo ‘mulig med ^banen ikke ‘sant? S: and ‘that is ‘possible with the ‘subway ‘right?

(7) (repeated extract)
S: det er e== ‘jobssøking. S: it’s uh== ‘job-seeking.
E: .. mhm. E: .. mhm.

The fact that they can terminate a sequence indicates that they do not themselves project a subsequent contribution. However, the interlocutor may on occasions expand the sequence further by producing, for instance, a minimal acknowledgement, thereby reconfirming the correctness of the construal (Sorjonen, 1996). But this will itself constitute an expansion of the sequence, and not a projected action.³ There may also be more substantive expansions, but this is not projected by the repeat either. In example (7), the explanation seems to be motivated by the client’s initial clarification question, which indicates that he has not understood what a job-seeking course consists of.

In the data, 60 instances gain no response, 107 gain a minimal response, and 10 gain a more expanded response in the form of topic expansion. It is interesting to note that none of the falling repeats are treated as problem indications and followed by repair. This then contrasts with the findings of Schegloff (1997) for
The repeats that gain no response are mainly of two types. First, they are receipts of answers that are followed immediately by a new question, as in example (8). Furthermore, they are receipts that are not given a separate acknowledgement because the interlocutor continues with on-topic talk, as in examples (6) and (11). The ones that gain a minimal response frequently involve closing the sequence and providing the opportunity to initiate a new one. To provide just a minimal response after a turn that does not itself develop the topic is a common way of closing sequences and topics (Schegloff, 1995; Svennevig, 1999). This is what happens in example (1), repeated in expanded form here:

(12) IFF 3 (repeated text)

S: hvor mange år gikk 'du på skolen da? S: for how many years did 'you go to school?
C: 'tolv år. C: 'twelve years.
S: 'tolv år. S: 'twelve years.
C: ja. C: yeah.
...(4.0) ((S skriver)) ...(4.0) ((S writes))
S: men e= etter at du kom til 'Norge, .. have you- . . . taken –
.. har du... gått – .. have you... taken –
du har ikke hatt no ^jobb, you !haven’t had a ^job,
C: .. nei. C: .. no.
S: men har du gått noe ^kurs? S: but have you taken any ^courses?

The repeat does not advance the topic or the sequence in progress, and the minimal acknowledgement that follows also ignores the opportunity to expand on the topic. The following extended pause creates an opportunity to initiate a new topic (a so-called ‘topic transition relevance place’, cf. Svennevig, 1999). In this way, minimal responses to receipts are sequence-closing moves. However, it is not uncommon to find that minimal responses are followed by topic expansion, as in example (7). In these cases, minimal responses seem just to reconfirm the correctness of the display. This appears especially relevant when an answer is written down (as in examples (12) and (13)), as there is the increased importance of ensuring that the construction is correct.

It does not seem to be differences in the repeat that decide whether a response is given to it or not. However, there is one class of cases which seems to be systematically responded to, and that is repetitions which expand on or rephrase prior talk, that is, which repeat material from several prior turns or which spell out ellipses or presuppositions contained in the previous utterance. In the following example the client has just told the clerk that she has four children:

(13) IFF 3

S: hvor gamle er 'de a, hvis du tar fra den 'minste og ^oppover. S: how old are 'they (then), if you go from the 'smallest and ^upward.
((utpeker trinn oppover)) (points out steps upward)
Although the clerk has already done some work to confirm the correct ages of the children along the way, he sums up the client’s multi-turn answer by a repeat of the ages of all the children as he writes them down. This repeat is thus more than a local repeat of the immediately prior utterance; it is a selective repetition of elements from the whole complex turn unit. Thus, the clerk does more than echo the interlocutor’s words; he interprets the utterances, selects elements from them and rephrases them to a certain degree. We are here at the borderline between a repeat and a paraphrase (cf. Svennevig, forthcoming a). Although the content is true to the original utterance, the formulation of it has changed to a certain extent. And this change may be the reason such repeats/reformulations are more systematically responded to: The repeater’s modification of the interlocutor’s answer requires some form of acceptance or validation from its original ‘author’ (Goffman, 1981; Svennevig, forthcoming a).

This pattern is also observable in cases where the native speaker corrects lexical, grammatical or idiomatic features in repeating an utterance by a non-native speaker. In the following extract, the clerk is talking to a refugee who is expecting his family to come to Norway in the near future:

(FINN 3)

S: ‘synes du det ‘begynner à ^ordne seg? S: do you ‘think things are ‘getting sorted ‘out?
‘synes du det ‘liksom ‘nå du ‘begynner à ‘se at ‘nå=, ‘nå er det [‘line ‘ting som ‘skjer?] ‘now [‘good ‘things are ‘happening?]
J: [jeg vil-] J: [I want-]
The original utterance here contains both grammatical errors and non-idiomatic forms, and also several hesitations and pauses. The clerk repeats the utterance in a correct, idiomatic and fluent form. Again, the client does more than just repeat the interlocutor’s utterance. She rephrases it somewhat, yet preserving the meaning of the original and also reproducing the major parts of the original’s linguistic form. This type of corrective repeats of non-native speakers’ utterances is also generally responded to, and again the explanation can be given that the original ‘author’ of the utterance has the right and obligation to ratify changes made on his or her behalf. The response is most often a minimal acknowledgement, as in the case above, but it may also take more elaborate forms.

3.3 DISTRIBUTION AND FUNCTIONS OF INFORMATION RECEIPTS

Why do interlocutors sometimes need to display explicitly that they have registered a piece of information? As noted in the introduction to this article, this is most often taken for granted and displayed only indirectly in the design of the next relevant action. However, there is not always a next relevant action. Sometimes a contribution does not project any further talk to come, and the topic is potentially exhausted. This provides for the relevance of giving explicit receipts, as it may constitute the only evidence speakers have for inspecting how their answer has been construed. As noted above, receipts typically come in third position after an adjacency pair, and this is just such a place where there might not be a new turn forthcoming that displays a construal of the answer.

Another position where receipts are observed to occur is after informing statements in other positions. Such ‘informings’ are often embedded in complex turn units that contain several pieces of information. This implies that the recipient has no other means of displaying his or her construal than receipts and listener response tokens that give the floor back to the main speaker. Here is an example, where the participants are talking about a Norwegian course:

(15) AETAT 1

S: det går på ’torsdager.
K: mhm?
S: og ’fredager,
K: mhm?
S: og ’er ikke så mange ”timer.
K: ehe?
S: på ’torsdar så ’er det fra.. ’tolv til ’tre,
K: ’tolv til ’tre.
S: ’Thursdays it ’is from.. ’twelve to ’three.
K: uhuh?
S: og ’er ikke så mange ”timer.
K: mhm?
S: and ’Fridays,
K: mhm?
S: and ’isn’t that many ’hours.
K: uhuh?
S: ’Thursdays it ’is from.. ’twelve to ’three.
Here the clerk is giving a series of details on the timetable of a Norwegian course. The repeated utterance is produced with non-final intonation, thus projecting more to come. If the recipient of the information is to display her construal of the information given so far, it must thus be by means of an inserted receipt, since the current activity does not allocate a ‘next turn’ to her at this point.

In describing the uses and functions of receipts, it is useful to draw a distinction between usages that are related to the content of the previous utterance, those that are related to the linguistic form of it, and those related to the institutional activity at hand.

The type of information that is most typically given receipts, is discrete, detailed pieces of exact information, that is, information that it is potentially important for the interlocutor to retain in an accurate form (Mazeland and ten Have, 1996). Receipts are in general dominated by mentions of numbers (as in examples (11) and (12)) and proper names (as in examples (6) and (10)), types of information in which the exact wording is essential. In everyday conversation a typical example of this is telephone numbers and addresses (Clark and Schaefer, 1987).

Another content-related aspect of repetition-triggering utterances is expectation. Receipts characteristically occur after answers that are contrary to expectations expressed in the question, such as in example (6):

(6) (Partially repeated extract)

K: [e=] ‘gå på den ^Bjerkebanen eller? K: [uh=] ‘go to that ^Bjerkebanen?
S: ‘nei det er på ^Linderudsenteret. S: ‘no it’s at ^Linderud Centre.

The fact that the speaker has expressed an expectation that is rejected in the answer provides for the increased relevance of displaying that the new information has indeed been registered.

Receipts related to the content of the information provided are used by clients as well as clerks, by native as well as non-native speakers. This contrasts with receipts related to the institutional activity or to the linguistic form of the utterance, which are more directly related to the differences in responsibilities and competencies between the parties.

Many receipts are related to the institutional activity at hand, especially to the clerk’s gathering of information about the client. This is predominantly done by question–answer pairs, with receipts as third-position moves. The ensuing pattern is reflected in the data by the fact that the clerks produce the vast majority of the receipts of answers (55 of 68 instances), whereas receipts of statements in other sequential environments are more equally distributed (clerks: 50, clients: 60).

Gathering information is to a certain degree based on lists of disconnected
questions, so that new items are introduced as points on an agenda, and do not ‘occur naturally’, that is, as occasioned by the ongoing topical talk. This means that an answer to a question often does not have any topically related ‘next action’, but rather a new item on the list of questions. In such environments, the use of a receipt is made relevant as a display how the answer has been perceived. This is in line with a study by Mazeland and ten Have (1996), who found that receipts were especially frequent in information gathering phases of institutional interactions.

A second characteristic of the activity that may motivate the extensive use of receipts is the official character of the interaction. The answers given by the clients are not just utterances to be understood by the clerk as an individual, but officially binding statements, which are recorded by the institution and used as a basis in the decision-making process. This is especially tangible when the clerk writes down the answers as the client speaks, such as in example (13). Here the repeat functions not just as a display of the clerk’s construal, but also as a display of what is going on record. The types of information that are given receipts often pertain to the institution’s system of classifying the clients. From the examples above we can mention such things as family background (examples 2, 3, 13) and date of entry into the labour market (example 11). Repetition may thus be a way of marking the official status of an answer as it is recorded for the institutional purposes at hand. The receipts related to the activity thus make relevant the participants’ institutional roles in that the receipts are produced by the clerk, as a clerk.

Finally, certain receipts in the data seem related to the clients’ lack of proficiency in Norwegian as a foreign language. Studies in second language interaction have shown that repetition is more frequent in native/non-native than in native conversation (Long, 1981). This seems true for these data as well, and they seem more frequent in conversations with poor second language speakers than with more fluent ones. Many receipts occur after utterances by the non-native speaker that are highly disjointed, phonologically or grammatically deviant, or unidiomatic. We have previously considered two such examples, (9) and (14), partially repeated here:

(9) (Repeated extract)

I: ..eh jeg ‘har ikke ‘bruikt den ‘mye ‘kommunen, S: ..(1.0) du ‘har ikke ‘bruikt ‘kommunen [‘mye.] I: ..eh I ‘haven’t ‘used it ‘much the ‘municipality. S: ..(1.0) you ‘haven’t ‘used the ‘municipality [‘much.]

(14) (Repeated extract)

The reason for using receipts after such utterances seems to be that the linguistic form is more indeterminate and thus more open to interpretation. A corrective repeat determines one of the possible linguistic structures it is possible to associate with the actual utterance and displays the hearer’s interpretation of it. These receipts are thus associated with the linguistic asymmetry of parties, and constitute a practice whereby native speakers display their construal of a devious utterance. The correction involved is backgrounded in that it is embedded in a sequentially relevant action – a receipt – rather than being exposed in a repair sequence (Jefferson, 1987).

Such modified third position repeats have been studied in Finnish native–non-native interaction by Kurhila (2001), who also treats them as embedded corrections. In Finnish, such repeats also occur with a final response word, but these are produced in a separate intonation unit and not as a de-accentuated tag.

In sum, receipts of information are produced by repeating an utterance with falling intonation. This constitutes a display of the speaker’s construal of linguistic form (hearing, level 2 in the action ladder). When a low-tone final response particle is added, the speaker signals that the utterance is also understood as a situated action (with a certain reference, illocutionary force and sequential implication, level 3) and accepted as a contribution to the current communicative project (level 4). They occur as third position expansions of adjacency pairs or as non-projected responses to statements in other sequential environments. They do not themselves project a next action, but are frequently responded to by a minimal acknowledgement, and systematically so when they represent a rephrasing of the original utterance. They are primarily used when the information given is unexpected or requires attention to form. Furthermore, they are used by clerks in order to display to their clients what information is going on record in the interview, and they are used by native speakers in order to display a modified construal of a devious utterance in the form of an embedded correction.

4. Rising repeats with polarity tags as stance markers

It was noted above that the addition of the polarity items ‘ja’ and ‘nei’ in final position signalled understanding and acceptance of the prior contribution. When the particle is produced in a high boundary tone (rising intonation), it seems to constitute a display of stance or attitude, such as surprise, interest, approval, etc. This can be seen in example (3), repeated here:

(3) (repeated)

S: du er ^gift du ikke ‘sant? S: you are ^married right?
@@[@@][@@]@@
S: [tre ‘barn ja?] [smiler] (three children yes)
S: [three children?] [smiles]
The repeat is produced simultaneously with another emotional display, namely, smiling. In addition, it comes in response to an answer that is followed by extensive laughter. This seems to indicate a positive evaluation of the answer (approval) or maybe surprise (given that the client looks rather young). The emotions displayed here and in the other instances are of positive valence (approval rather than disapproval, interest rather than indifference etc.), and this seems to be essential to the function of the repeat. One would expect negative evaluations of the interlocutor’s report to indicate potential misalignment, and thus be repair-relevant.

A way of adding emotional intensity to a repeat may be to use emphatic intonation, that is, markedly raised pitch and increased loudness. As shown by Selting (1996), such emphatic (‘astonished’) repeats seem to convey a breach of expectations.

Unlike other rising repeats, the repeat in example (3) is not responded to by the interlocutor. The repeater does not even seem to expect a response, since he immediately goes on to ask a new question. This question is a typical request for elaboration, as evidenced by the final particle ‘da’ (here reduced to ‘a’). This marks the repeat as a different type of action than repair initiation.

Most often, though, such repeats are responded to, but not by repair:

(16) IFF 4

S: ... (1.0) (H) men du ‘begynte å jobbe med ’en gang,…
   eller gikk du på noen ’norskopplæring ’først?
D: e== nei jeg= …(2.0) e== sånn ’to og ^tyvende jeg kom, og så ’da hadde jeg ’jobb på ^forhånd.
S: du ‘h hadde-re på ^forhånd ja?
D: jeg ‘h hadde sånn e=.. ’arbeids e= tilbud fra= . . . ‘Oslo ^kjøttbilen, i ’gamle dager var det ^Meat Van <X så X>.
S: <H ja H> S: <H yeah H>
D: og ’så= det er ’svogern min ^skafte meg ’det.
S: <H ja H> S: <H yeah H>
D: . . . ’første ’fem ’dager ’gikk vi ’bare for sånn ^undersøkelse.

This repeat is responded to, but not as a request for confirmation, nor as an indication of a problem of understanding or alignment. The interlocutor does not
initiate repair, but expands on the subject, giving further details on the nature of the job offer.

In both these examples we see that the repetition format ‘repeat + high tone response tag’ leads to elaboration of the topic. In the first instance, the repeater pursues a response by making a request for elaboration, whereas, in the second, the main speaker himself offers elaboration in response to the repeat.

Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) treat rising repeats as belonging to a class of ‘topicalizers’, together with expressions like ‘really?’ (cf. also Button and Casey, 1984). They describe their function in the following way: ‘Topicalizers placed after pre-topical questions, then, display interest and actively promote topical talk related to the reply’ (p. 308). This description fits many of the instances in the corpus. In the examples above, the repeats do indeed follow answers to questions that are potentially initiating a pre-topical sequence. But in other cases repeats occur in positions that are not topic introductory. In the following excerpt the client is in the middle of telling about her complications in giving birth to her youngest son. The repeat occurs in the middle of an extended narrative, at a point where the client has already signalled that there is more to come:

(17) AETAT 1

K: andre barn.. !siste barn, K: other child.. !last child,  
‘den er ^vanskelig, ‘that one is ^difficult  
han har så u- fo- ‘forsinket for- uvi-  
^utvikling, ^development,  
S: ä=kei. S: o=key.  
K: ja han ’også masse ’sjekker på ’Ullevål  
^sykehuse=t, ^hospital=,  
.. ’han= ^fådt, .. ’he= ^born,  
‘han er ’puster ikke. ‘he is ’doesn’t ^breathe,  
han også== he also==  
S: ’.. ^puster ikke nei? S: ’.. ^breathe (no)?  
(breathes not no)  
K: ja X han= ^=fådt, K: yeah X he= =born,  
S: [o- okey] S: [o- okey]  
K: [ja fådt e=] ute, K: [yeah born e=} out,  
de=t ’puster ikke den= ’tre ^minutter, ‘he ‘be ‘on ‘that es- ek- ‘extra ^oxygen,  
’han ‘gå ’pa ’den es- ek- ’ekstra  
^øksyndjen, ^oxygen.  
S: <HI ja=[=] HI> S: <HI yeah=[=] HI>  
K: [H ja H>] K: [<H yeah H>]  
og ‘etterpå han ’også blo- ‘blå.. [far]ge, and ‘afterwards he ‘also bleu-blue.. [col]our,  
‘veldig ^dårlig. EMP> ‘very ^poorly. EMP>  
K: og så ’etterpå ’greid han se=g <EMP  
‘veldig ^dårlig. EMP>  
S: mhm, S: mhm.

The narrative is announced as an account of the retarded development of the youngest son. The repeat requests expansion of a certain part of the narrative.
namely, the fact that the child did not breathe. Just before the repeat, the client may be seen in the course of moving on to the effects of the incident or the announced conclusion (the child’s retarded development). At this point the clerk interrupts with a repeat with a high-tone response particle, and this is treated by the client as a request for elaboration; she accounts for the incident in greater detail in the following turn.

Rising repeats may thus occur also outside of topic-initiating sequences, and consequently there is a need for a more general description of their functions. They occur in a vast range of sequential positions, but systematically follow ‘informings’, that is, presentation of information that is purportedly new to the addressee and which constitutes the privileged knowledge to the speaker (‘A-events’ in Labov’s (1972) terms). In the examples above, for instance, the pieces of information concern the personal biography of the client, and they are presented in response to questions that display the clerk’s unawareness of these matters.

Heritage (1984) discusses a related response type that also includes repetition with rising intonation, namely ‘newsmarks’ (following Jefferson, 1981). These are constituted by a variety of ‘assertions of ritualized disbelief’, such as ‘really?’, ‘you did?’, etc., thus centrally including pronominalized repeats (pro-repeats for short). These responses ‘treat a prior turn’s talk as news for the recipient rather than merely informative. In this regard, all newsmarks project further talk by the news deliverer/newsmark recipient by reference to the news’ (Heritage, 1984: 341). The elaboration of the news is either volunteered by the news-deliverer or solicited by the news-recipient. Jefferson and Heritage do not specify what they mean by ‘news’, but it seems to imply information that is treated as both new and as surprising or interesting. As we see, this account fits very well with the instances above. The repeats seem to express ‘ritualized disbelief’ in the sense that they question what has just been said, while simultaneously signalling that the utterance has been heard and understood.

Both Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) and Heritage (1984) focus on the role of rising repeats in eliciting or projecting further topical talk. However, sometimes these repeats only gain a confirmation and no subsequent elaboration, such as here:

(18) IFF 4

D: ‘siden jeg har vært e= ’butikkbestyrer oppå= ^arbeidsgiveren min og=,
S: ... ‘du har vært ^butikkbestyrer og 'greier ja?
   (you have been shop manager and things yes)
D: ja.
S: (H) e ’siste ‘jobben,
    når ‘slutta du–
D: 'since I have been uh=' shop manager
    a=t my ^employer’s and=,
S: ... 'you’ve been a ^shop manager and
    ‘stuff (yes)?
D: yeah.
S: (H) uh the ‘last ‘job,
    when did you ‘end–
This repeat comes toward the end of the client’s account of his work experience. The repeat clearly expresses approval of the achievements of the client, as further evidenced by the expression ‘og greier’ (‘and stuff’). The repeat could certainly have been taken as an invitation to expand on the matter, but the client does not take this opportunity and instead produces just a minimal response. The clerk does not continue with a request for elaboration, and so the topic is closed and a new issue is raised.

In cases where rising repeats do not engender topical expansion, they are sometimes followed by assessments by the same speaker instead, such as here:

(19) IFF 1

A: [‘yeah=] he ‘looks after the ^children. [[@@@]]
S: [han ‘passer ^barna] ja? S: [he ‘looks after the ^children] (yes)?
S: ^det er jo ^fint. S: ^that’s ^nice.
A: . . .<Hx yeah= Hx> (THROAT)
S: . . . har !mannen din vært i ‘Norge ‘lenger enn ^deg eller? S: . . . has your !husband been in ‘Norway ‘longer than ^you?

The repeat is not followed by topical expansion by either of the parties. Instead the repeater produces assessments, which is one of the resources typically used as a resource for closing topics (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992; Jefferson, 1993). What is common to examples (18) and (19), then, is that they express an evaluation of the interlocutor’s report, either alone or in conjunction with an assessment. Thus, it seems that these repeats may contribute to closing topics as well as expanding them.

Rather than making the projection of topical talk the central characteristic of these repeats, I propose that they are first and foremost displays of affective stance, and that the function of establishing or closing topics is secondary and derivative. In displaying the addressee’s emotional stance towards a given utterance, they have a central evaluative component. Evaluation may on some occasions be a marker of interest and thus give rise to the inference that the repeater wants to hear more, on other occasions it may be a way of showing appreciation of a story or a report and thus suggest that the topic is potentially exhausted. In fact, the evaluative load of these repeats assimilates them to assessments, which display the same functional ambiguity. Assessments have been noted to occur both as topicalizers in topic-initiating sequences (Svennevig, 1999) and as topic-closing moves (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992; Jefferson, 1993). If this is correct, the function of opening or closing topics will constitute a secondary function, relative to the position of the repeat. After an introductory topical bid it will elicit an expansion of the report, whereas after a potentially complete report it will be heard as an appreciation of it and thus a topic-closing move.
Many reports are ambiguous as to their completeness. For instance, in example (19) the clerk’s favourable affective display could have been used as an occasion to tell in more detail about the husband’s involvement at home, in parallel with the way the repeat in example (16) was exploited. Instead, it is treated just as a local post-expansion to the question–answer pair. In such cases, the interactants thus seem to have the choice of treating the repeat as either a topicalizer or a request for confirmation. In other words, they have the opportunity, but not the obligation, to expand.

5. Ellipsis, pronominalization and non-nativeness

The repetitions by the native clerks in the corpus display some characteristic form features that seem oriented to the non-nativeness of the client. In particular, they conserve to a large extent the full form of the original utterance rather than employing ellipsis and pronominalization, as is usual in native conversation. In some cases, they even expand the structure presented by the non-native speaker.

Ellipsis is a common phenomenon in all forms of repetition. When the new and important information is contained in a single constituent rather than the clause as a whole, speakers generally repeat just the focused constituent and leave out the other parts of the utterance. This may be shown by examples (3) and (15), partially repeated here:

(3) (repeated extract)

S: du er ^gift du ikke ^sant? S: you are ^married right?
A: 'ja= jeg har tre ^barn. A: 'yes= I have three ^children.
     @@@|@@@@|@ S: [tre ^barn ja?] ((smiler)) S: [three children?] ((smiles))

(15) (repeated extract)

S: på ^torders så ^er det fra.. ^tolv til ^tre, S: ‘Thursdays it ’is from.. ’twelve to ^three,

The constituent that is repeated in these examples is the intonationally focused part of the previous utterance. This is also most commonly the constituent carrying the main informational load, being the prototypical locus of new information. For instance, in example (15) it is already known from the previous talk that the Norwegian course is on Thursdays; what is new is the time.

Ellipsis may also alternate with word-by-word repetition to focus on specific parts of an utterance, as in example (18):

(18) (repeated extract)

D: ‘siden jeg har vært e= ^butikkbestyrer oppå= ^arbeidsgiveren min og=, D: ‘since I have been uh= ^shop manager a=t my ^employer’s and=,
S: ... ‘du har vært ^butikkbestyrer og ^greier ja?' S: ... ‘you’ve been a ^shop manager and ^stuff (yes)’
Here, the adverbial ‘oppå arbeidsgiveren min’ (at my employer’s) of the original utterance is elided for the same reason; it is not the new and important information provided by the utterance. Ellipsis is thus used in the repeat to display which part of the utterance is the object of surprise or approval.

What is characteristic of the clerks’ repetitions in this corpus is that they often conserve the full form of the original utterance rather than employ ellipsis. In certain receipts the native speaker repeats the full clause even if the new information is presented just in a single constituent:

(20) AETFAT 1

S: er det=.. hvordan- hvordan ‘føler du at ditt ‘sosiale ^liv er? har du kontakt med ‘an=dre i- e= ‘kvinner e= fra din ^nasjonalite=t eller?  
K: .. e= jeg e= det er ‘ikke <@ ^tid. @>  
S: [du hakke] ’tid.  
K: neii.  
K: ‘lørdag gå på det ^tamilskole, barn- ‘tre barn også, gå på ^tamilskole.  
S: gå på ^tamilskole ja.  
K: [XX]

Here, the whole verb phrase is repeated rather than the final preposition phrase (‘på tamilskole’ – ‘to Tamil school’) or the noun phrase (‘tamilskole’ – ‘Tamil school’), although the primary new information is contained in these phrases. As they are talking about not having time for social contact, it is not new or unexpected that there are activities taking up her time – what is new is the character of those activities.

When the prosodically and informationally backgrounded parts are not elided in the repeat, they are often pronominalized. This is the case in example (16), partially repeated here:

(16) (repeated extract)

D: og så ‘da hadde jeg ‘jobb på ^forhånd.  
S: du ‘hadde-re på ^forhånd ja?  
S: you ‘had it in ^beforehand (yes)?

Here, the noun ‘job’ is pronominalized in the repeat, thus backgrounding it and rather focusing on the adverbial phrase in beforehand as the new and interesting information.

This corpus is characterized by the fact that the native speakers’ repeats are often in full form even when the new information is contained in a single constituent. This is the case here:
The new information given here is not that the speaker has a sister but that she is married. That the referent ‘søsteren’ (the sister) is not pronominalized thus contrasts with the normal pattern for pronominalization in repetition. As with the lack of ellipsis, the lack of pronominalization testifies to an orientation toward the linguistic asymmetry by involving an extra effort to display one’s construal of linguistic form.

A different use of pronominalization is to replace the focused part of the previous utterance by a pro-term (pronouns, pro-verbs and pro-adverbials), such as here:

(22) AETAT 3

K: jeg har ‘navnet= <X i industri= X> <Lamberseter, Lambertseter, K: I have the ‘name= <X of Industry= X> S: har du ‘det ja? (have you that yes) ‘pro-repeat (Heritage, 1984). The repeat does not display much of the construal of linguistic form, apart from a structure of the type ‘I have x’. This involves taking the construal of linguistic form (level 1 in the action ladder) more or less for granted, as it displays only a rough sketch of it. In this way, pro-repeats presuppose hearing and are primarily used to display other things, such as understanding and emotional stance.

Pro-repeats are not very common in the corpus under investigation here. There are in all only 3 instances out of 195. Even in stance-marking repeats the speakers seem to employ mainly word-by-word repetition. This contrasts with the findings of Heritage (1984), which indicate that pro-repeats are more used than word-by-word repetition as news receipts. It also contrasts with my own inspection of a corpus of informal conversations between native speakers (the corpus used in Svennevig 1999), where pro-repeats seem to be the most common format in stance-marking repetition. In the current corpus, the native speakers
often produce full clausal repeats in environments where only a pro-repeat would be required as a stance marker. In all the examples given above (examples (16)–(19)), a pro-repeat would have been an equally clear and unambiguous stance marker. The reason repetitions conserve the full form to a larger extent here may be related to the non-nativeness of the client. The stance-marking repeats in the corpus are all performed by the native clerks, and the use of a full form may be concerned with securing an acceptable construal of linguistic form even in cases when the repeat is primarily doing something else, namely, displaying emotional stance.

A related characteristic phenomenon found in the corpus is repetition that does not omit or pronominalize constituents but, on the contrary, expands on the structure presented by the non-native speaker. There are two such instances in the following excerpt:

(23) IFF 1

S: ... hva jobba 'månen din med 'for du-' 'for han ble 'pensjonist a? 'before you- 'before he 'retired?
A: ... <L Freia. L>
S: jobba på 'Freia ja. S: worked at 'Freia (yes).
A: ja @ <@ lage 'sjokolade. @> A: yeah @ <@ make 'chocolate. @>
S: jaja.
A: @@@ (H) A: @@@ (H)
S: det er jo 'godt det. S: that sure is 'good.
A: mia\ @@ (H) ((S smiles)) A: myeah\ @@ (H) ((S smiles))
S: ... men det er kanskje ikke så 'bra for ^kroppen. S: ... but it's maybe not so 'good for the ^body.
A: @ <@ nei det er 'færlig. @> A: @ <@ no it's 'dangerous. @>
S: det er 'farlig for ^kroppen ja. S: it’s 'dangerous for the ^body (yes).
A: <P ja\ P> A: <P yeah\ P>

In the first instance, the non-native speaker gives a short answer that is somewhat incongruent to the question in that she supplies only the company name rather than a job designation. The native speaker repeats this answer but simultaneously expands it by adding a verb phrase that makes the answer more congruent to the question. In the second instance, the non-native speaker’s answer is also slightly deviant in that it contains the non-idiomatic adjective ‘farlig’ (dangerous) rather than ‘usunt’ (unhealthy) or the like. Here again, the native speaker repeats the answer rather than correcting it, but in addition expands it into a more explicit and unambiguous phrase.

These expanded repeats show an orientation by the native speaker towards construing the non-native speaker’s answer as an acceptable and idiomatic contribution. The expanded form is used to disambiguate and ‘normalize’ the non-native’s utterance. This constitutes an instance of ‘scaffolding’, which competent speakers are observed to perform on the utterances of non-competent speakers, such as children and non-natives (Ellis, 1994).
7. Conclusion

The repeats investigated in this article have in common that they constitute practices for registering receipt of information. Those with falling intonation do little more than this, whereas those with a response particle with rising intonation in addition display emotional stance, such as surprise, approval, or the like. They are all primarily responsive turns, occurring after answers to questions or informing statements in other positions. Falling receipts are potentially sequence-closing turns, whereas rising receipts invite a response. Simple repetition claims hearing (identification of phonological form), whereas the addition of a response particle also claims understanding and acceptance.

Many of the native speakers’ repetitions display an orientation to the linguistic asymmetry of the situation. A recurrent pattern in all the forms of repetition is that they are produced in full – or even expanded – form, thus leading to less ellipsis and less pronominalization than in native speaker interactions. This may be motivated by an increased need to display one’s construal of the interlocutor’s utterance due to the frequency of non-standard phonological features. The repeats also frequently involve form modifications that bring the utterance into accordance with the pragmatic or grammatical conventions of the language. These modifications are not done as outright corrections, but are embedded in the sequentially relevant actions performed by the main functions of the repeats, namely displaying receipt of information, checking hearing and marking emotional stance.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

The conversations are transcribed according to the system developed by Du Bois et al. (1991, 1993). In the presentation the English translation is mainly an idiomatic, and not a literal, one. In cases where the wording of the original repetition differs significantly from the English translation, a gloss line is provided underneath (in italics) with a more literal, word-by-word translation.

UNITs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intonation unit</td>
<td>{carriage return}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncated intonation unit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncated word</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech overlap</td>
<td>[ ], [[ ]]{vertically aligned brackets}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRANSITIONAL CONTINUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCENT AND LENGTHENING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary stress</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary stress</td>
<td>‘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthening</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAUSE
Long (>0.7) ...(N)
Medium (0.3–0.7) ...
Short (<0.3) ..
Latching (0)

VOCAL NOISES
Vocal noises (COUGH), (THROAT), etc.
Inhalation (H)
Exhalation (Hx)
Laughter @ (one per spurt)

QUALITY
Piano (soft) <P P>
Forte (loud) <F F>
Allegro (rapid) <A A>
Lento (slow) <L L>
High pitch <HI HI>
Laugh quality <@ @>
Produced on in-breath <HI H>
Emphatic prosody <EMP EMP>

PHONETICS
Phonetic transcription (/ /)

TRANSCRIPTOR’S PERSPECTIVE
Researcher’s comment ((COMMENT))
Uncertain hearing <X X>
Indecipherable syllable X
Focus of analysis bold face
Non-verbal events (italics) (time range indicated by underlining in the transcription)

NOTES
1. Side sequences that are used to monitor the process of interaction in this way have previously been described in Svennevig (1999) under the label ‘metacommunicative monitor sequences’.
2. High and low tone particles are transcribed with a full stop and a question mark respectively, in accordance with the general system for marking falling and rising intonation.
3. This parallels the standard account of adjacency pairs, where the third position expansion is considered a ‘facultative’ expansion which is not projected by the second pair part in itself, but which may on occasions be called for by other concerns (such as for instance displaying the answer as ‘news’ by producing the change-of-state token ‘oh’, cf. Heritage (1984).
4. Clerks sometimes avoid this agenda-based format and instead make the talk evolve in a more topically coherent matter, thereby achieving the effect of informalizing the interaction (cf. Svennevig, 2001).
5. In contrast to this, Button (1992) describes a practice of holding back any form of third position expansion in job interviews as a way of not revealing to the applicant how an answer has been understood and evaluated.
6. The emotional displays accounted for here are not meant to be claims about the actual
emotional states of the interlocutors. Displays of surprise, approval etc. may of course be sincere or insincere, spontaneous or strategic etc.

7. In addition, the vowel /a/ is pronounced with a rather deviant quality, more akin to the neighbouring phoneme /æ/.

REFERENCES


Svennevig, J. (forthcoming b) ‘Repetition as Repair Initiation in Native/Non-Native Interaction’.

JAN SVENNEVIG is Professor of Communication at the Norwegian School of Management BI. He received his doctorate in Linguistics from the University of Oslo in 1997. Recently, he has been carrying out a research project on native–non-native interaction in public
offices, with a focus on conversational practices enhancing mutual understanding. His current research deals with the conversational management of diversity in the workplace. His recent publications include *Getting Acquainted in Conversation* (John Benjamins, 1999) and ‘Echo answers in native/non-native interaction’, *Pragmatics*, forthcoming. **ADDRESS:** Norwegian School of Management BI, Department of Communication, Culture, and Languages, PO Box 580, 1302 Sandvika, Norway. [email: jan.svennevig@bi.no]